



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,659	02/23/2004	Dae-Sik Oh	2621	2345
28005	7590	08/03/2007	EXAMINER	
SPRINT			KIM, WESLEY LEO	
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY				
KSOPHT0101-Z2100			ART UNIT	
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			PAPER NUMBER	
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/03/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/784,659	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OH, DAE-SIK	
	<b>Examiner</b> Wesley L. Kim	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 9, 22, 23 and 28-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 9, 22-23, and 28-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/27/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 5/27/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant argues that the combination of Bacon et al, Valentine et al, and Fukushima et al fails to disclose or suggest (i) responsively activating an alert at the fixed wireless device of the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device as recited in claim 1, and (ii) alert logic arranged to invoke the alert mechanism so as to provide an alert at the wireless local loop hub in response to the determination that the current location of the wireless local loop hub does not match the registered location of the wireless local loop hub as recited in claim 22.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Valentine teaches that it is well known in the art to responsively activate an alert at a wireless device if the registered location (i.e. registered coverage area) of the wireless device does not match the current location of the wireless device (Col.9:6-18, a fixed wireless device is mobile so it could be seen as a wireless device). The alert notifies the user that changes must be made in order to continue utilizing the services of wireless device (Col.9:12-18) where the wireless device is registered to the terrestrially based mobile telecommunication system. Therefore, when the wireless device travels outside the registered location (a comparison is obviously made to determine if the current location matches the registered location) an alert notifies the user that they are

outside the registered location. Further, from Valentine, it is obvious that there exists an alert logic arranged to invoke the alert mechanism to provide the alert at the wireless local loop hub (i.e. wireless device) since an alert is sounded based on whether the wireless device is within a registered area or not (Col.9;12-18), where Bacon further teaches that a wireless device may be a fixed wireless device (Col.5;5-27, i.e. wireless local loop hub).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 22-23, and 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacon et al (US Patent 6836644 B2) in view of Valentine (US Patent 6088589) and Fukushima et al (US Pub 2003/0073438 A1).

**Regarding Claims 1, 22, 28, and 36**, Bacon teaches a method carried out at a fixed wireless device, the method comprising: comparing a registered location of the fixed wireless device to a current location of the fixed wireless device, wherein the registered location is stored at the fixed wireless device and comprises information indicating a customer premises where the fixed wireless device is located (Col.5;5-27); however Bacon is **silent on** responsively activating an alert at the fixed wireless device if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device; after activating the alert,

at an interface of the fixed wireless device, receiving location information for changing the registered location stored at the fixed wireless device to match the current location of the fixed wireless device; and changing the registered location stored at the fixed wireless device to match the current location of the fixed wireless device.

Valentine teaches that it is well known in the art to responsively activate an alert at a wireless device if the registered location of the wireless device does not match the current location of the wireless device (Col.9;6-18, a fixed wireless device is mobile so it could be seen as a wireless device). The alert notifies the user that changes must be made in order to continue utilizing the services of wireless device (Col.9;12-18).

Fukushima further teaches that when a computer is moved from one region to another it can update its own position information in the memory so as to conform to the radio communication standard of the region where the position indicated by the position information belongs (Par.46). To the examiner a fixed wireless device is a computer and when the computer moves from one region to another it would be obvious to combine Valentine with Fukushima to indicate to the user, via an alert, that a change must be made to continue utilizing the services associated with the computer.

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Bacon with Valentine and Fukushima such that, an alert is responsively activated at the fixed wireless device if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not

match the current location of the fixed wireless device; after activating the alert, at an interface of the fixed wireless device, receiving location information for changing the registered location stored at the fixed wireless device to match the current location of the fixed wireless device; and changing the registered location stored at the fixed wireless device to match the current location of the fixed wireless device, to provide a method of notifying a user that a change must be made in order to continue utilizing services of the fixed wireless device so that services are not terminated due to moving outside of a registered location area.

**With further regards to Claim 37**, from Bacon and Valentine, if the current location matches the registered location, then there is no action taken, i.e. no alert.

**Regarding Claims 4-6, 9, and 29-33**, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is very well known in the art that an alert may be audible, or visual light emitted by a light emitting diode, or message type visible on a display.

**Regarding Claim 23 and 34**, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is very well known in the art that wireless devices display messages on a liquid crystal display.

**Regarding Claim 35**, Bacon further teaches that the customer premises includes an alternating current outlet and customer premise equipment connectable to the fixed wireless device, and wherein the fixed wireless device receives power from the alternating current outlet (Fig.1).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesley L. Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-7867. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WLK

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wesley Kim". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Wesley" and the last name "Kim" clearly distinguishable.A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "George Eng". The signature is cursive and stylized.

GEORGE ENG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER